

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 33 are presently pending. In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 10, 13 – 24, 27 and 30 – 33 under 35 U. S. C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wong ('394). Claims 11, 12, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Richards *et al.* ('853). Claims 1 – 8 were also rejected over Claims 1 – 4 of U. S. Patent No. 6,765,535 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

By this Amendment, Claim 13 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 21 – 25. Other minor amendments have been made as well. Claims 1 – 12, 21 – 25, 30 – 33 have been canceled. New Claim 34 has been drawn along the lines of Claim 9. Claim 35 depends from Claim 34 and more narrowly defines the means for splitting recited therein. New Claims 36 – 38 are drafted with respect to the embodiment of Fig. 12 of the disclosure.


Inasmuch as Claims 25 and 26 were indicated as being allowable, Claims 13 – 20, 26 – 29 should now be allowable. Claims 34 and 35 should be allowable inasmuch as, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Wong does not teach, disclose or suggest means for splitting a received wavefront, reflecting a portion thereof and transmitting a portion thereof.

In addition, the prior art does not teach, disclose or suggest an amplifier having an array of elements disposed on a substrate with means for defining an axis of tilt of a beam generated thereby. Hence, Claims 36 – 38 should be allowable as well.

Reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Kenneth W. Brown *et al.*

By



Thomas J. Finn, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,066

WJB/lc

Raytheon Company
1151 E. Hermans Road
Bldg. 807/F8
Tucson, AZ 85706

(520) 794-7980
(520) 794-8171 facsimile